UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/583,999	06/22/2006	Kazumitsu Shiomi	0425-1258PUS1	3390	
	7590 07/01/201 ART KOLASCH & BI		EXAMINER		
PO BOX 747	CH 3/A 22040 0747	MCKENZIE, THOMAS B			
FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/01/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/583,999	SHIOMI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	THOMAS BENNETT MCKENZIE	1797				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this cor (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
,—	- action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> are subject to restriction and/or ele	ection requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	-					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce		Examiner.				
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			R 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			• •			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)⊡ Some * c)⊡ None of:	. ,	, , ,				
·— ·— ·—						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No				
application from the International Bureau	•		· ·			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	ατοπτ προποαποιτ				

Application/Control Number: 10/583,999 Page 2

Art Unit: 1797

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3 and 7, drawn to a filter for a gas generator.

Group II, claim(s) 4-6, drawn to a method of manufacturing a filter for a gas generator.

2. The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The invention of Group I (claims 1-3 and 7) lacks a technical feature presented in Group II (claims 4-6). Specifically, Group I does not mention, nor would it be obvious to make the filter of Group I with a heat processing step where tubular material is kept at a temperature not less than a melting point of the lower melting point metal but less than a sintering temperature of the metal of the core wire, then cooled.

3. A telephone call was made to Po-Wei Chen on 06/25/2010 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Application/Control Number: 10/583,999

Page 3

Art Unit: 1797

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

- 5. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.
- 6. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof.

 Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

 Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.
- 7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

 Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise

Application/Control Number: 10/583,999

Art Unit: 1797

require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 4

- 8. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS BENNETT MCKENZIE whose telephone number is (571) 270-5327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-5:00PM Alt. Friday 7:30AM-4:00PM EST..

Application/Control Number: 10/583,999 Page 5

Art Unit: 1797

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DUANE SMITH can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Duane Smith/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

TBM